

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED  
JUL 27 2005  
2005 AUG -4 A 9:45

Isaac Murray,

CIVIL ACTION NO.3:05-1560-MJP-JRM

Plaintiff,

ORDER

-vs-

US ATTORNEY STROM  
THURMOND, JR.;  
GARNER ATTORNEY CHARLIE  
CONDON;  
US JUSTICE DEPT;  
JUDGE LNU, RICHLAND COUNTY  
PROBATE;  
SC LEGISLATIVE DEPT;  
LAWYER KLIGHAMAN;  
ALL DEPARTMENT OF THE  
CONSTITUTION; STATE  
GOVERNMENT; FEDERAL  
GOVERNMENT; US GOVERNMENT;  
ALL WORLD GOVERNMENT DOES;  
JOHNNIE MAE BENJAMIN;  
FREDDIE JAMISON;  
THOSE THAT BE IN TB CAMPS;  
CRAFT FARROW;  
STATE HOSPITAL;  
BRYAN PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL  
MORRIS VILLAGES;  
JAMES L.;  
ALL BUSINESSES;  
ALL CORPORATIONS;  
ALL COMPANIES; AND  
ALL PRIVATE ENTITIES,

Defendants.

The plaintiff Isaac Murray proceeding *pro se* filed the instant civil action as well as

a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The plaintiff, a patient at a state mental institution, has named numerous defendants in this matter. The relief sought by the plaintiff is:

See to it that I am to be given as speedy a trial as possible against the Richland County probate court for my sake and for the benefit of all mankind.


Pursuant to the Local Rules of this Court, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for review. In his report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court dismiss this action due to the plaintiff's failure to state a cause of action upon which this court can grant relief. The plaintiff has not objected to the recommendation.


The applicable standard of review for this Court is clear. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Matthews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the report and recommendation to which specific objection is made 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C). However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge as to those portions of the recommendation to which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In the instant action, the plaintiff has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

2  
The Court is aware that the plaintiff is *pro se* and has carefully reviewed the plaintiff's complaint. Upon review, the Court finds no basis upon which this court can exercise jurisdiction over the allegations set forth in plaintiff's complaint. Accordingly, the Court concurs with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this case should be dismissed.

**The Magistrate Judge's recommendation is approved. For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this action is hereby DISMISSED.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**MATTHEW J. PERRY, JR.**  
**SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

 **Columbia, South Carolina**  
**August 2, 2005.**